

# OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 324113

Laura Preston Collins

pollnagroagh

Athenry

Galway

H65PN56

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 17 April 2026

**Re: Observation to the proposed development of open-cycle gas turbine (OCGT) and generator with ancillary equipment.**

Location: Pollnagroagh and Rathmorrissy (Townlands), Athenry, Co. Galway

Applicant: Bord Gáis Energy Limited

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am one of the closet residents to this proposed plant. I live down wind of the plant and I am extremely worried about my personal health and also my families. A large construction business is located adjacent to my home at the moment and even with that business and all the other local traffic, farmers, schools and local quarries, this road not not even suitable for all of this existing traffic. I am a 5th generation family member on my family land and I believe it is grossly unfair that a plant of this nature be built solely based on a financial basis due to the location of the gas line and power station. Over the years, Athenry is growing out, and developing into one of the fastest growing towns in Ireland and it is hard to believe that this plant is proposed at the wrong location solely due to financial gain. It will ruin the heritage town and have serious health implications for me going forward.

## **Public Health Protection**

There is significant concern within the community about the potential impact of air pollution from this proposed peaker plant on human health, particularly during periods when it is operating at full capacity and

emissions are highest. The possible use of diesel is especially worrying, as it introduces additional harmful pollutants that can travel long distances and accumulate in the environment.

There is ongoing uncertainty concerning the operational frequency of the plant, its emission rates, and the extent of public exposure to pollutants through 2050. Because these issues remain unresolved, it is difficult to verify that all risks have been considered. Given these unknowns, it is wise to adopt a careful strategy to protect public health; unless definitive evidence proves no harm, any dangers to residents should be considered as part of the planning process.

### **Long-Term Accumulation of Pollutants and Chemical Residues**

I am particularly concerned about the risk of pollution to soil and groundwater from this proposed development. The inclusion of diesel storage tanks, hardstanding areas, drainage systems, and other infrastructure increases the likelihood that pollutants could gradually enter the ground over time, potentially up to 2050. Substances such as hydrocarbons from diesel and gas, along with other chemical residues, may build up slowly, particularly where there are repeated small leaks, routine operational losses, or occasional spills, with impacts accumulating over time.

What is especially worrying is that this type of pollution may not be immediately visible but could result in long-term damage to groundwater quality and soil health. This has implications not only for environmental protection but also for local agriculture, which depends on clean soil and water. Overall, there is significant concern that these long-term and cumulative risks have not been fully addressed and could have lasting consequences for the local environment and livelihoods.

### **ACRES Compliance**

As a local farmer, I am very concerned about how this proposed development could affect my ability to meet environmental standards. Farmers in this area already operate under strict requirements, including schemes such as ACRES and nitrates regulations, and we take these responsibilities seriously. However, emissions, airborne pollution, or runoff from this peaker plant—particularly linked to diesel use—could increase nitrate levels or environmental pressure, potentially pushing farms out of compliance through no fault of their own.

As an ACRES participant, any increase in pollution associated with this development could directly impact compliance with scheme requirements, leading to penalties, financial loss, or exclusion from essential programmes. This creates an unfair situation where farmers may be held responsible for environmental impacts arising from an industrial activity outside their control, placing an unjust burden on the farming community.

### **Vulnerability to Diesel-Related Air Pollution**

As a parent living in the area, I am particularly concerned about the potential impact of this proposed development on children's health. Children are particularly susceptible to the effects of air pollution because of their developing respiratory systems, elevated respiration rates, and greater exposure to outdoor environments. Although peaker plants do not function on a continuous basis, they can produce significantly elevated levels of output during initial start-up phases or times of peak energy demand. This may lead to brief yet significant emissions of pollutants, particularly when diesel fuel is utilised. These emissions contain fine particles and nitrogen oxides that can penetrate deep into the lungs, which may affect lung development and increase the risk of respiratory conditions such as asthma. Overall, this raises serious concerns about the health and wellbeing of children and whether these risks have been fully considered.

### **Increased Heavy Traffic and Diesel Transport Risks**

As someone who lives locally and uses this road, I am concerned about road safety in relation to the proposed entrance on the L3103. This stretch of road is already extremely narrow, with no hard shoulder, making it difficult for two heavy goods vehicles to pass safely and leaving no margin for error. Visibility is also poor due to blind dips and sharp bends, meaning drivers often cannot see oncoming traffic in time. The proposed development would increase traffic levels, including heavy goods vehicles, construction traffic, and fuel deliveries such as diesel tankers, all of which require space and clear sightlines that this road does not provide.

Given that these rural roads are used by residents, farm machinery, and school-related traffic, the addition of significant industrial traffic would increase the risk of accidents and create a more hazardous environment. Overall, there is strong concern that the existing road infrastructure is not suitable for this level of traffic and that the associated safety risks have not been adequately addressed.

### **Risk of Fire and Explosion from Fuel Storage**

As someone living in the area, I am very concerned about the safety risks associated with this proposed development. The project involves the storage, handling, and use of highly flammable fuels such as natural gas and diesel, which carry an inherent risk of fire or explosion. In the event of equipment malfunctions, leaks, or operational challenges, these substances may pose an ignition risk, potentially resulting in significant incidents. Considering the intermittent yet high-intensity operation of a peaker plant, the likelihood of such occurrences warrants careful consideration.

The potential consequences are particularly worrying, as any incident could have serious impacts on nearby homes, residents, farmland, and livestock. This raises significant concerns about whether the risks have been fully assessed and whether this location is appropriate for a development of this nature.

### **Landscape Character and Policy Conflict**

There are serious concerns that the proposed development would represent a significant industrial intrusion into a rural landscape characterised by agricultural land use and dispersed residential development. The scale, height, and industrial nature of the plant—including buildings, stacks, lighting, and fuel storage—would fundamentally alter the character of the area, introducing a visually dominant feature into what is currently a quiet rural setting. This type of development does not appear consistent with the existing landscape, nor does the area have the capacity to absorb such change without significant adverse effects. These concerns are particularly relevant in the context of the Galway County Development Plan, specifically Policies LCM1, LCM2, and LCM3, which seek to protect landscape character, recognise landscape sensitivity, and ensure that development is appropriate to its setting.

### **Availability of Cleaner Alternatives**

Although cleaner and more sustainable alternatives to fossil fuels—such as renewable energy, energy storage, demand response, and grid flexibility measures—are available, building new gas infrastructure may lessen the urgency to invest in these solutions. Given the climate crisis, emphasis should be placed on low-carbon and renewable options instead of furthering dependence on fossil fuels; this proposal could delay the shift toward a more sustainable energy system.

### **Lack of Clear, Accessible, and Effective Communication**

There are concerns that community engagement in relation to this project has been insufficient and ineffective. Many residents did not receive any direct communication or notification about the proposed

development, and while some individuals report receiving a flyer or attending an information event, the material provided was highly technical and difficult to understand without specialist knowledge. This limits meaningful public participation, as effective consultation requires information to be accessible, clearly explained, and actively communicated to all affected members of the community. In this case, the complexity and level of technical detail in the documentation creates a barrier to understanding, meaning that many people cannot fully assess the potential impacts of the development.

### **Failure to Properly Assess Cumulative and Long-Term Impacts**

There are concerns that the Environmental Impact Assessment does not adequately assess cumulative impacts, including the combined effects of emissions, noise, traffic, diesel use, and ongoing environmental disturbance over time. These impacts may interact and intensify, particularly during peak operational periods, yet this interaction has not been fully examined. The long-term nature of the development, potentially extending to at least 2050, further increases the importance of understanding these cumulative effects. Without a comprehensive assessment, it is difficult to fully understand the overall environmental burden of the project, and this represents a significant gap in the evaluation.

### **Operational Uncertainty and Lack of Enforceable Limits**

There are concerns that the Environmental Impact Assessment relies on assumed operational scenarios rather than fully assessing worst-case conditions. As the plant will operate in response to electricity demand, there is uncertainty regarding how frequently or intensively it may run, including periods when diesel will be used, potentially resulting in higher emissions than those modelled. Without a thorough evaluation of the worst-case scenario, it is not possible to confidently rule out the possibility of major environmental impacts.

### **Conclusion**

There are serious concerns regarding environmental impacts, safety risks, and the adequacy of the assessment process. The Environmental Impact Assessment overlooks cumulative, long-term, and worst-case scenarios, depending instead on assumptions that may not accurately represent the actual operation of the development. This leads to considerable uncertainty regarding the real extent of its impacts. For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that approval for the proposed development be refused.

Yours Sincerely,

Laura  
Preston  
Collins

Name: Laura Preston Collins

Date: 17 April 2026